

victims are still waiting. They have waited for 83 days. They waited while Congress went on vacation. They waited all weekend. And they are still waiting. They are waiting for some sign of hope. They are waiting without their homes, in trailers. They are waiting without jobs. They are waiting without the ability to work in their fields. They are waiting without their businesses.

I stand ready with my Democratic colleagues to pass a disaster relief bill that just does that, it provides disaster relief to working people who are struggling to get on with their lives and provide it today, now, in a few minutes. Disaster relief. Nothing more. Nothing less. No census formulas. No Government shutdown clauses. Disaster relief.

It is not complicated. It should not be controversial. Enough is enough. The flood victims have run out of patience. Let us vote on disaster relief and do it now. Nothing more. Nothing less. Stay with the proposal that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be offering on the previous question to vote it down to bring a clean bill to the floor. Stay with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE], who got up here and gave an eloquent statement about the misery of the people that he represents. Stay with your colleague, who wants a clean bill. My colleagues would want no less if they were in his shoes.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I shall speak for just a few seconds, Mr. Speaker.

The one way to begin to bring relief tonight to the people who are affected in this disaster is to vote to send this back to committee so the process can be rejuvenated and worked out. If my colleagues vote for the previous question, Mr. Speaker, it creates chaos in this body. I urge my colleagues to assist the people in our country who are crying out for relief in the disaster by voting to send this bill to committee.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion to refer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the motion to refer.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 205, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—216

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Batesman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske

Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood

NAYS—205

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin

Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell

Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez

Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman

NOT VOTING—13

Barcia
Becerra
Boucher
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Flake
Metcalfe
Molinari
Packard

□ 1956

Messrs. MARTINEZ, HALL of Texas, and McDERMOTT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BILBRAY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. PEASE]. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 9, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives. I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on June 9,

Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Fazio
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gedensson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon

1997 at 2:34 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits proposed legislation entitled the "Cloning Prohibition Act of 1997."

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

CLONING PROHIBITION ACT OF
1997—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESI-
DENT OF THE UNITED STATES
(H. DOC. NO. 105-97)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for immediate consideration and prompt enactment the "Cloning Prohibition Act of 1997." This legislative proposal would prohibit any attempt to create a human being using somatic cell nuclear transfer technology, the method that was used to create Dolly the sheep. This proposal will also provide for further review of the ethical and scientific issues associated with the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer in human beings.

Following the February report that a sheep had been successfully cloned using a new technique, I requested my National Bioethics Advisory Commission to examine the ethical and legal implications of applying the same cloning technology to human beings. The Commission concluded that at this time "it is morally unacceptable for anyone in the public or private sector, whether in a research or clinical setting, to attempt to create a child using somatic cell nuclear transfer cloning" and recommended that Federal legislation be enacted to prohibit such activities. I agree with the Commission's conclusion and am transmitting this legislative proposal to implement its recommendation.

Various forms of cloning technology have been used for decades resulting in important biomedical and agricultural advances. Genes, cells, tissues, and even whole plants and animals have been cloned to develop new therapies for treating such disorders as cancer, diabetes, and cystic fibrosis. Cloning technology also holds promise for producing replacement skin, cartilage, or bone tissue for burn or accident victims, and nerve tissue to treat spinal cord injury. Therefore, nothing in the "Cloning Prohibition Act of 1997" restricts activities in other areas of biomedical and agricultural research that involve: (1) the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer or other cloning technologies to clone molecules, DNA, cells, and tissues; or (2) the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer techniques to create animals.

The Commission recommended that such legislation provide for further re-

view of the state or somatic cell nuclear transfer technology and the ethical and social issues attendant to its potential use to create human beings. My legislative proposal would implement this recommendation and assign responsibility for the review, to be completed in the fifth year after passage of the legislation, to the National Bioethics Advisory Commission.

I urge the Congress to give this legislation prompt and favorable consideration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 9, 1997.

□ 2000

NO WAY TO RUN A CONGRESS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 83 days since the President first asked this Congress for disaster relief legislation. Flood-stricken families in the Midwest are desperately waiting for these funds. Yet the majority has loaded up this bill with provisions the President has said that he cannot accept in an effort to embarrass him.

Let me quote from today's Wall Street Journal that says Speaker NEWT GINGRICH has privately indicated that he never expected the President to sign the bill sent to him. Let me also mention what Republicans are privately conceding, that this is more of a rhetorical attempt to embarrass Mr. Clinton, put themselves in a better light after helping to provoke shutdowns in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about people's lives. There are literally tens of thousands of people unable to make basic decisions about their lives until this bill is enacted. Yet the majority refuses to send a bill without these provisions to the President. This simply is no way to run a Congress.

Mr. Speaker, providing Federal assistance to the victims in times of crisis is one of the fundamental roles of the United States Congress, yet my Republican colleagues would abdicate this basic responsibility in order to score political points.

I implore the majority to stop playing politics with people's lives. Send the President a clean disaster bill today.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GEPHARDT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BONIOR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WE SHOULD NOT SACRIFICE FREE-
DOM OF EXPRESSION WITH A
FLAG AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, in 2 days we are going to be debating an amendment to the Constitution dealing with the flag. The proposed flag amendment to the Constitution deals with more than just the issue of freedom of speech. It involves the right of free expression and the right to own property. These two are inseparable. A free society cannot have one without the other; and when one is compromised, so is the other.

When property rights are correctly honored, free expression is guaranteed through that right. The independence of a newspaper, radio station or a church guarantees the use of that property in any free expression desired. No one has the right to use any newspaper, radio or church to exert his or her own opinion as an example of free speech. Catholics have no right to say Mass in a Jewish temple. Certainly in our homes we are protected from others imposing their free speech on us. It is the church property that guarantees freedom of religion. The networks or papers need not submit to demands to be heard by religious believers as an example of free speech. Use of the radio or newspaper by those with strong opinions or religious views is only done voluntarily with the permission of the owner.

Yes, it is very important who owns the flag and where it was desecrated. What if it is in a home or in a church for some weird reason? Do the police invade the premises? Who gets sent in? The BATF, the DEA, the FBI, the U.S. Army or the U.S. flag police? If it is on government property or a government flag or someone else's flag, that is an attack on property that can and should be prosecuted. By legislating against how someone else's flag is being used, the right of free expression and property ownership is infringed just as if it were church property or a newspaper.

We work diligently to protect controversial expression in books, television and movies and even bizarre religious activities through the concept of